

City of Sherwood, Oregon
Planning Commission Meeting

January 17, 1995

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call.** Vice-Chairman Corrado called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Commission members present were: Vice-Chairman Chris Corrado, Marge Stewart, George Bechtold, Susan Claus, and Rick Hohnbaum. Gene Birchill and Ken Shannon were out of town. Planning Director Carole Connell, Assistant Planner Lisa Nell and Secretary Teresa Minor were also present.

2. **Minutes of December 13, 1994 meetings:**

Vice-Chairman Corrado called for a vote on approval for the minutes on December 13, 1994 and advised that the minutes for the December 20, 1995 meeting were not available at this time. There being no correction or additions, Vice-Chairman Corrado advised that the minutes of the December 13, 1994, meeting will stand approved as presented.

3. **Introduction of Assistant Planner, Lisa D. Nell**

Ms. Carole Connell introduced the new Assistant Planner Lisa D. Nell, who joined the City staff on January 3, 1995.

4. **SUB 93-2 Cinnamon Hills Phase 2 Final Plat: a 43-lot single-family subdivision on Pine Street:**

Vice-Chairman Corrado advised that SUB 93-2 Cinnamon Hills Phase 2 Final Plat has been removed from the agenda and continued to February 7, 1995. Ms. Connell informed the Commission that the reason for the continuance was due to the applicant's engineer being ill, and a couple technical questions that needed to be answered. She indicated the problems will be resolved before the next meeting, and then the engineer will be able to answer Commission questions.

In response to Mr. Hohnbaum's question, Ms. Connell advised that the 90-day waiver did not apply to this decision but does apply to a preliminary plat.

In response to Ms. Claus' question regarding the question on the pedestrian access, Ms. Connell replied that she had told him he needs to do it, the location had not been changed and if he could find a better location then it would be considered. Ms. Connell stated that her questions were regarding storm water and easements.

Mr. Hohnbaum asked if the last Commission packet included anything regarding Cinnamon Hills. The Commission agreed that none of their packets contained anything regarding Cinnamon Hills.

5. Public Hearings:

A. CUP 94-2 & SP 94-4: Conditional Use and Site Plan request for a 27,272 square foot industrial warehouse on a portion of a four acre parcel on Tualatin-Sherwood Road:

Vice-Chairman Corrado read the hearings disclosure statement and requested that Commission members reveal any conflict of interest, ex-parte contact or bias regarding any issues on the agenda.

There being no disclosures, Vice-Chairman Corrado called for a staff report.

Ms. Carole Connell informed the Commission that this was a joint application for a conditional use permit and site plan approval. The two are combined for expediency for the applicant and for the City, but separate motions could be made for each of them.

Ms. Connell advised that the request is for a 27,272 square foot industrial warehouse on the Tualatin-Sherwood Road. The facility will be in Building A with a future Building B to the west, which will be returned to the Commission for site plan review at a later time. She explained that Triple S Sales is a distributor of specialty food products and confectioners. The building is to be used for warehousing and supporting office space. There is to be no food manufacturing, handling, or packaging in the building or on the site. This will be purely a facility to accept and distribute these products. There will be no outdoor storage or display. Ms. Connell continued with an in-depth review of the Staff Report, dated January 10, 1995, a complete copy of which is contained in the Commission's minutes book.

Ms. Connell pointed out that in her report she stated that the site adjoins the wildlife refuge. This should have been corrected in the report to indicated that the site adjoins the study area but that there is not a formal refuge yet. She explained that it is the opinion of the City Manager that we cannot apply the 20 foot setback, on the south property line of the site, to a study area; it has to be a designated park. Ms. Connell explained that there is a good chance much

of the study area will not eventually be in the refuge, but as stated later in her report the 20 foot setback would not be required at this time.

Ms. Connell recommended that based on the above findings of fact, CUP 94-2 be approved subject to the conditions outlined in the Staff report dated January 10, 1995.

Ms. Connell then questioned the Commission if they would like to stop and discuss CUP 94-2 and make a motion or continue through the details of the site plan and then make a decision on the CUP. Commission decided to continue with the site plan.

Ms. Connell continued with her in-depth review of the requirements for site plan approval for SP 94-4 Triple S Sales, a complete copy of which is contained in the Commission's minute book. She reminded the Commission of the things they are able to look at for site approval. These include scale, mass, height, appearance, design of buildings, vehicular facilities, topography, vegetation, and so on.

Ms. Connell pointed that there is limited lot depth and constraints placed on the site by the large BPA power easement. Because of the BPA power easement and the limited lot depth, there is not a lot that can be done on the site besides what is being proposed.

Ms. Connell recommended approval of both the CUP 94-2 and SP 94-4 with no conditions tied to the CUP and those conditions being tied with the site plan approval were discussed.

Vice-Chairman Corrado next opened the public hearing for comments from proponents.

Russ Leach, architect for the owner, P.O. Box 1016, Sherwood, explained that regarding the conditional use permit application the owner of the property and building, Doug Seever, is in attendance, and would be happy to respond to any questions the Commission might have about his business. He discussed the misunderstanding of the conditional use was due to the fact that in the LI zone everything that is allowed in the commercial zone also is allowed, and when examining it, it appeared to them that it was clearly permitted in the LI zone. After going over the language they discovered (also, the opinion of the City Manager) that a conditional use would be part of the requirements. Mr. Leach explained that Mr. Seeber's business was a typical light industrial, distributor business of a product.

Mr. Leach explained that in regards to the design review they were in concurrence with all conditions. He showed the original two entrances into the site that were proposed and explained that if the balance of the property were to be developed in the future they would bring it back to the Planning Commission at that time. He explained that the County had surprised them by requiring that a dedication of 12 feet be made at the front of the property for future road expansion. With regard to the 20 foot front landscape corridor setback that was originally proposed, and as discussed earlier by Ms. Connell, Mr. Leach noted that the ordinance requires only 15 feet. But since everything had to be moved back because of the 12 foot dedication that the County is requiring, the paving had to be moved back to 20 feet and because it is getting tight for truck maneuvering and driving Mr. Leach asked the Commission to consider a change from 20 feet to 15 feet as required in the ordinance.

Mr. Leach explained the location of the sewer and water and discussed the recommendation by Ms. Connell for an easement to continue from the edge of Phase 1 to the edge of the property where Phase 2 would be developed. For the Commission's interest he explained that there were no specific plans for Phase 2 but that it was an unusual site in the respect that there was a 250 foot BPA easement that crosses the corner of the site. He explained what could be done in this area. Mr. Leach discussed the proposal to place 38 new trees on the site in exchange for removal of three not very good trees. With regards to the engineering Mr. Leach stated that they would be doing the utility engineering and presented the location of the water quality site. Having no further comments, Mr. Leach offered to answer any questions the Commission might have.

In response to Mr. Bechtold's question regarding the site having twice as many parking spaces as required, Mr. Leach explained that Triple S Sales would not be occupying the site completely and some parking would be needed for the other occupant of the site.

Ms. Stewart asked for clarification of the location of where the sewer and water would extend to and whether the location of Phase 2 was included in the same tax lot. Mr. Leach explained that the sewer now extends to the property and is stubbed into the property. He continued that it is all located on the same tax lot but what they propose is to extend the sewer and water when the other portion is developed because it is uncertain what will occur in that location. Ms. Stewart asked Mr. Leach what would occur if someone decided to develop on the other side of the site and

you decide not to develop the middle location. Ms. Connell answered that at a minimum the Public Works Director would say we need an easement so we have access to the services. Mr. Leach commented that the applicant had no problem with extending the services, but feels it should be extended as the property develops. Ms. Connell explained that in the case of who would pay for the extension if this were to occur, she pointed out that there would be a payback agreement issued so that when the rest of the site was developed they would have paid their share of the cost of the extension.

Mr. Hohnbaum questioned the location of the fire hydrants on the site. Mr. Leach showed the present location of the fire hydrant and explained that a building with a sprinkler system is required by the fire marshal to have a hydrant located within 500 feet.

Vice-Chairman Corrado questioned what the number of employees anticipated to work out of the facility would be and what the use of the sub-tenant would add in capacity to the location.

Mr. Seeber, owner of the business, answered that currently there were 18 employees working for him, and based on past history there would be one or two added each year, totaling eight or nine new employees over the next ten years. In regards to the sub-tenant Mr. Leach commented that Triple S Sales would occupy two-thirds of the building and that the design was created to compensate for changes in the sub-tenant. Mr. Corrado questioned whether the balance of the building was warehouse or if it had office capabilities and how much square footage would be left in the space not occupied by Triple S Sales. Mr. Leach answered that the balance was office capability and the purpose of all the windows in the design was so that it would not appear like a concrete box. He stated that the square footage of the unoccupied area was 9,000 square feet.

In response to Mr. Bechtold's question regarding the width of the parking spaces against the Tualatin-Sherwood Road and the building, Mr. Leach explained that there is about 40 feet in between and that back to back parking was 75 feet and the applicant would like to change it to 80 feet. The problem exists in the loading points with the ability to maneuver into these areas. He added that the reason for wanting 5 more feet was for good design and good function.

Ms. Stewart commented that she was still concerned about the payback arrangements in case the other side of the property were to develop before Phase 2 of this project occurred. Ms. Connell explained that since the City Engineer knows the rest

of the area can be developed at a later time, he is comfortable with waiting until later to extend the services. Vice-Chairman Corrado added that this did not preclude adjacent property owners from doing anything because the easement is there, it just becomes an administrative issue. Ms. Stewart continued that when a sewer line is extended and a homeowner connects, they always take it to the outside edge so an adjacent homeowner can connect, this is about the same situation. Mr. Leach commented that technically this is divided into two lots, but it is not subdivided. He suggested that, for all practical purposes and the way in which the parcel will be developed, the applicants would like consideration for the expense of extending utilities for the adjacent property.

There being no further proponent testimony, Vice-Chairman Corrado opened the public hearing for comments from opponents.

There being no opponent testimony, Vice-Chairman Corrado closed the public hearing and opened the meeting for comments, questions and discussions among the Commissioners.

Mr. Hohnbaum questioned staff if there was any consideration for screening the site for garbage placed outside in order to prevent waste from entering the proposed wildlife refuge. In response, Ms. Connell remarked that she did not believe there was any proposed outside waste receptacles but if there is any outside pick-up, screening would be required. Mr. Leach commented that he thought it had been discussed in the narrative, but that the proposal is to store the cardboard and refuge in the building, as they have been doing in the Tualatin area until time for disposal.

Mr. Hohnbaum advised that the Commission might bestow on the applicant the importance of erosion control during development because of the boundary with the proposed wildlife refuge. He suggested that maybe hay bales might not be sufficient for erosion control in the area of the proposed wildlife refuge. Ms. Connell responded that there were already erosion control practices for new construction but if stricter standards were felt to be needed the time is not now to discuss them and the Commission could highlight erosion control as a condition to make sure it is adequate, especially for the area adjoining the proposed wildlife refuge. Then when we are reviewing the final plans we will take special care. Mr. Hohnbaum agreed that this be done and that the Commission needs to make their position clear that anything less than that would be unacceptable. Mr. Bechtold suggested that the Commission might make the applicant liable

for the damage if steps are not taken for proper erosion control instead of the City being liable. Vice-Chairman Corrado agreed with the comment but questioned the ability to impose the condition or restriction. Ms. Stewart asked if something could be added to recommendation three to address this issue. Vice-Chairman Corrado answered that this would be a location to address this issue and that the Commission could urge special consideration for this issue. Ms. Connell suggested that it read "special consideration should be given to ensuring adequate erosion control during site construction to protect the adjoining Rock Creek and Tualatin River National Refuge Study area". Vice-Chairman Corrado suggested that all the Commission could do is put them on notice that it is a point of concern and a responsible developer will take note of that and hopefully make accommodations as they can under what they are required to do. Mr. Hohnbaum question what the options were if they did not follow through with what they have been asked to do. Ms. Connell advised that they would be stopped and required to do what they are supposed to do. Vice-Chairman Corrado commented that the safe guards were already in effect to respond to a situation if it occurs. In response to Mr. Hohnbaum's question Ms. Connell stated that the manager of the wildlife refuge has never contacted her regarding any development notices sent regarding the area bordering the wildlife refuge.

In response to Ms. Claus' question regarding the difficulty with trucks maneuvering in the parking lot, Mr. Leach commented that this was part of the reason for them asking for 5 more feet to prevent a problem in maneuvering.

Ms. Claus questioned the nature of the secondary tenant. Mr. Leach commented that it was unknown at this time. Ms. Claus next questioned if there would be a physical separation between the two tenants, and if one of the docking areas would be for the other tenant and how many parking spaces would be allocated for the this tenant. In response Mr. Leach added that there would be a wall between the two and that one of the docking areas would be for this tenant. In regards to parking spaces there would be up to 17 with Mr. Seeber using 18.

Ms. Claus stated that her concern was that this is a conditional use permit and if we are making the recommendation and the approval based on the primary tenant what do we do about the secondary tenant if there is a problem, will the secondary tenant come to the Commission to make sure it is in conjunction with what the primary tenant is doing or what we think is okay in the area. Ms. Connell answered that the new tenant would have to come in for a

business license and if it is a conditional use they will have to come to the Commission and we will have to reevaluate the site, but if it is a permitted use then one of the things I will review is to make sure there is ample parking. Mr. Leach added that a building permit would be needed for improvements for the space. Ms. Stewart commented that the applicant was already providing more parking than required. Mr. Seeber added currently his 18 employees were using 12 parking spaces, 6 of these people were outside sales people who periodically come and go. Ms. Connell commented that parking could be added to the west side if needed. The Commission discussed some of the options that might be taken in the event that more parking be needed in the future.

Ms. Connell reassured Ms. Claus that the business license process and the application for a building permit would be an adequate trigger for a review of the secondary tenant and that the timeline for review of the conditional use was permanent for the use. She added that in this case she felt that the conditions were more appropriate to the site plan not necessarily to the conditional use permit but that if the Commission felt that special conditions needed to be applied to the use they could attach something to the conditional use permit.

In regards to Ms. Claus question, Ms. Connell stated that the use was found in the zoning and it reads "Manufacturing, compounding, processing, assembling, packaging, treatment, fabrication, wholesaling, warehousing or storage of the following articles or products," and the first one is "Food products, including but not limited to candy, dairy products, beverages, coffee, canned goods and baked goods, and meat and poultry,..." and in this case we do have candy and it is food so it is clearly a conditional use. In the case of the secondary tenant, they could have a use that is similar to the use of the primary tenant or any of the allowed uses, but if they have one of the conditional uses we have not reviewed, we would have to review it.

In response to Mr. Bechtold's question, Mr. Leach explained that the windy swale was part of the requirements by USA that the engineer designs to, and the retention aspect is new and has only been in effect for about 6 months. He pointed out that the City Engineer calls the shot but the criteria set by USA is what is used. In response to Ms. Connell's statement Mr. Leach stated that they had designed enough water retention sites and were not concerned with any difficulties in the engineering when getting USA approval.

In responding to Ms. Stewart's question Vice-Chairman Corrado

stated to Ms. Connell that he thought she had said in answering Ms. Claus' previous question that they were confined to approving the conditional use permit for the uses specified in this specific request. Ms. Connell recommended that the decision notice state exactly what is being approved in the conditional use permit, the distribution and storage of prepackaged foods.

Vice-Chairman Corrado agreed and questioned whether they were allowed to change the 20 foot landscape strip to 15 feet as requested by the applicant. Ms. Connell replied that it could be changed because they actually exceed the requirements and a condition could be written stating that the landscape strip may be reduced from 20 feet to 15 feet.

There being no further questions or comments by the Commission Vice-Chairman Corrado asked for a motion of approval.

Ms. Stewart moved that, based on the findings of facts, CUP 94-2 and SP 94-4 Triple S Sales be approved subject to the following conditions:

Prior to issuance of a building permit the following conditions must be satisfied:

1. Extend the sanitary sewer and water to the western edge of Building A. Provide an on-site utility easement from the new service lines to the western property boundary for future utility access to Building B.
2. Provide a sidewalk from the building to the existing sidewalk adjoining Tualatin-Sherwood Road.
3. All stormwater runoff must be directed to a detention and treatment facility in the northeast corner of the site. Detention and treatment must be approved by the City and USA. Respond to USA's industrial waste questionnaire. Special consideration shall be given to ensuring adequate erosion control during site construction to protect the adjoining Rock Creek and Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge Study area.
4. Plant at least five (5) evenly spaced evergreen trees in the front yard landscape strip behind and alternating with the proposed deciduous trees. Provide evenly spaced evergreen trees (25 feet on-center) in the landscape bed on the west and south sides of the building.

5. In accordance with their letter dated December 27, 1994 comply with Washington County road dedication and improvement requirements, driveway access and sight distance and separation specifications, and traffic safety requirements. Obtain a County facility permit.
6. Provide an outdoor lighting plan for City approval. Use high-pressure sodium lighting. Minimize lighting on the south side of the building.
7. Submit engineered construction plans for City, USA, TVFRD, and County approval illustrating public and private utility improvements and estimated costs. Enter into a development compliance agreement guaranteeing completion of the City approved plans.
8. Develop a uniform signage plan and apply for a City sign permit prior to installation of any signage.
9. Provide two secured bicycle parking stalls.
10. Provide a fire hydrant within 250 feet of all sides of the building.
11. The landscape strip adjoining Tualatin-Sherwood Road may be reduced to fifteen (15) feet.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hohnbaum.

Vice-Chairman Corrado asked for any discussion by the Commission.

Mr. Bechtold asked whether the recommendation for the conditional use permit was for the wholesale distribution of prepackaged foods as discussed. Ms. Connell replied that it would be stated as a statement not a condition in the decision notice as to what the approval is for.

There being no further discussion among the Commissioners and upon call of the question, the motion carried unanimously.

B. CUP 94-3 & SP 94-5: Conditional Use request for an outdoor display of heavy equipment and Site Plan request for a 7,500 square foot building for equipment display and repair and office use on Tualatin-Sherwood Road.

Ms. Connell began the Staff Report by informing the Commission that this was a similar application with the conditional use permit being for outdoor display and the

accompanying site plan is for the building site characteristics that go with it. She added that the site is located on the Tualatin-Sherwood Road near Cipole Road. It is a 7,500 square foot building for the rental, sales and repair of Halton tractors and equipment. Ms. Connell continued with an in-depth review of the Staff Report, dated January 10, 1995, a complete copy of which is contained in the Commission minute book.

Ms. Connell pointed out the entry was on the Novak Subdivision the City of Sherwood approved last fall. It will be a public street that goes on to two more lots.

Ms. Connell explained that she had spent some time during her report referring to the previous subdivision, the reason being that the construction plans for the subdivision had been prepared but not yet approved and the final plat had not been recorded. For this reason, Ms. Connell stated she felt that it was important that before any building permits are issued for this project, a performance bond needed to be in place for the subdivision and the subdivision needed to be recorded, in order to make sure the street and utility improvements associated with this site and the other sites north of it are completed. She stated that the City Engineer agreed that as long as the bonding was in place the improvements would be guaranteed.

Ms. Connell continued that she would like to revise her position on the issue and say that the bonding will need to be done prior to any building permits being issued.

Ms. Connell discussed USA's recommendations and added them as conditions for approval.

Ms. Connell commented that she felt that the outdoor display was integral to the operation and recommended that the Commission approve the conditional use permit with no conditions.

Ms. Connell continued that the site plan showed about 13% of the site is landscaped and with 4.4% in building coverage. She pointed out that the plan illustrates the addition of 46 street trees with the existing trees adjoining the building, parking lot, display area, and Tualatin-Sherwood Road frontage. Those areas and the northern lot perimeter are supplemented with over 400 shrubs, lawn and other groundcover and many of the plants used are native or the same as existing species on site. She explained that the plan complies with the requirements except that the landscape strip along the north property line is required to be 10 feet

wide and it is only 5 feet wide on the plan.

Ms. Connell reviewed the conditions for approval and recommended that SP 94-5 be approved subject to those conditions and changes.

Vice-Chairman Corrado opened the public hearing for comments from the applicant and proponents.

Mike Candianides of Sabre Construction Co., 7235 S.W. Bonita Road, Tigard, introduced himself and his associates Tony Halton, Mark Fahey and Chuck Harrison, all from Halton Tractor.

Mr. Candianides began by stating that they agreed with everything Ms. Connell had said. He wanted to explain that the landscape area on the north side was drawn at 5 feet because they thought when they developed the other site they would provide another 5 feet at that time so there would be the required 10 feet. He explained that the main focal point was the display area and they would like to keep it separated with the landscape from the maneuvering area.

Mike Fahey, P.O. Box 3377, Portland, gave the Commission a brief history of Halton Tractor and explained that their intent was to have new model, well maintained equipment on the site; Caterpillar equipment, boom lifts and scissor lifts would be some of the equipment found on the site.

Tony Halton, 4334 N.E. Columbia Blvd., Portland, addressed the Commission and explained that Halton's rental yard started 4 years ago and it was their plan to offer new and very low hour equipment, catering to the construction business. He assured the Commission that scaffolding would never be part of their operation. He presented the Commission with photos so that they could observe the quality of their fleet.

Mr. Halton pointed to where the storage would be located on the west end of the site. He explained that this facility would house three people to begin with and would be used primarily for a parts drop for Halton Co. on the heavy end and that very little repair would be done at this site.

Mr. Halton pointed out that the display lighting would resemble theater lighting and that there would be no unsightly lighting when you drive by, what you would see is the equipment blending with the natural surroundings. He continued that no more than 3-5 pieces of equipment would be on display at one time. The goal was to have a very simple

display with everything being very subtle.

Vice-Chairman Corrado assured the representatives of Halton Tractor that they meant no offense by the comment made regarding heavy equipment being unsightly. He added that the pictures were disturbing to him because he envisioned how Columbia Blvd. looked but that Mr. Halton's comment regarding no more than 3-5 pieces of equipment being on display reassured him.

There being no further proponent testimony, Vice-Chairman Corrado opened the public hearing for comments from opponents.

There being no opponent testimony, Vice-Chairman Corrado closed the public hearing and opened the meeting for comments, questions and discussions among the Commission.

Mr. Hohnbaum questioned whether there would be any problems with Pacific Lumber regarding the type of building style being constructed on this site. Ms. Connell explained that she did not anticipate any because the difference was that the lumber company was in a commercial zone and in an area being planned to have a certain look and this was in an industrial zone.

In response to Ms. Claus' question Mr. Halton explained that the repair facility for major repair work was located on Columbia Blvd. After introduction by Mr. Halton, Chuck Harrison, in charge of all of Halton's environmental issues, stated that all of the facilities have holding areas for used oils and antifreeze and they are pumped on a regular basis by a reputable company and recycled. He envisioned that at this site these holding areas would be kept undercover on the west end of the building in the storage site where they could not be seen. He explained that they are planning a wash pad on this site that will capture all the water, process it and bring it up to acceptable USA standards before it is discharged.

Mr. Halton responded to Ms. Claus' question by saying it was his understanding that the conditional use permit was for the display area.

Mr. Bechtold commented, that due to experience with other companies that have come before the Commission, his concern was being able to believe that there will never be more than 3-5 pieces of equipment on display at the same time. Ms. Claus questioned Mr. Halton regarding the issue and he commented that he did not put a guarantee on the statement,

but that if anyone ever drove by and saw too many pieces of equipment on display they were welcome to come in and let them know. But his vision did not include more than five and if the Commission would like to add a condition regarding the issue he would be happy to concur. Vice-Chairman Corrado questioned if they could foresee an occasion ever arising where they would want to display more equipment in the display area. After discussion of the issue it was decided that a condition be added to allow more than five pieces of equipment on display up to four times a year for a period of up to five days.

In responding to Ms. Stewart's concern regarding comments by USA regarding extending the sanitary sewer and storm sewer to the adjacent property, Ms. Connell commented that she agreed with the concern and that she felt that they were covered.

There being no further discussion by the Commission, Vice-Chairman Corrado asked for a motion for approval.

Mr. Halton commented that the Commission had not addressed the issue of the 5 foot landscape area on the north side of the building. In response, Ms. Connell stated that she was observing the code and the code requires 10 feet and it would end up that there would be two 10 foot landscape areas when the other site develops.

Ms. Claus moved, based on the findings of fact, that CUP 94-3 and SP 94-5 be approved subject to the following conditions:

Prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. Submit engineered construction plans for City, USA, TVFRD and County approval illustrating public and private utility improvement and estimated costs of street, water, sanitary and storm sewer, erosion control, hydrant locations, lighting, solid waste disposal and landscaping provisions. Public improvements shall be secured by a performance bond. Specifically:

Storm water:

- a. Provide an evaluation of downstream storm conveyance. The existing conveyance should be adequate to take the flows from the site during a 25-year, 24-hour storm event without causing damage to any existing structures.
- b. A water quality and detention facility shall be

provided in accordance with City and USA standards. The facility is intended to remove 65% of the phosphorous from the run-off of the newly created impervious surface. For the purposes of this project, the compacted slag surface is calculated the same as gravel. Multiply the total square feet of slag surface by .40 and add that number to the total of new impervious surface for design criteria and monthly charges.

- c. Verify that sanitary sewer and storm sewer is extended to adjacent properties which logically could flow through this development.
- d. A detailed erosion control prevention plan showing special wet weather measures shall be submitted with the detailed grading plan.
- e. Provide adequate water drainage facilities in the parking and loading areas.

Fire Prevention:

- a. Locate fire hydrants within 250 feet from the exterior of the building as measured around the outside of the structure and along the route of travel accessible to the fire apparatus.
- b. Provide a knock box security system at the gated driveway for TVFRD emergency access.

Tualatin-Sherwood Road:

- a. Establish a one-foot non-access reserve strip along the site's frontage.
- b. Ensure that 49 feet of right-of-way from centerline is dedicated to the County for road purposes.
- c. Obtain an access permit from the County.

Unnamed Local Street:

- a. Provide half-street improvements to City standards.

Water:

- a. Extend water service to the northeast corner of

the lot.

2. Provide evidence that the Novak Subdivision (SUB 94-3) has been recorded at Washington County. The public street and public utility improvements must be bonded for prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. Do not remove any trees over four inches (4") in diameter.
4. Increase the landscape strip along the north property line to ten (10') feet. Provide sight-obscuring fencing on the north property line. Plantings along those boundaries must be at least three (3') feet tall.
5. Provide a sidewalk from the building to the public sidewalk on the local street.
6. Provide two (2) secured bicycle parking spaces near the building entry.
7. Apply for an administrative sign permit prior to sign installation.
8. The display area shall be limited to five (5) items on display, except that up to four (4) times a year, more equipment may be displayed for a period of up to five (5) days.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hohnbaum.

There being no further discussion among the Commissioners and upon call of the question, the motion carried unanimously.

6. F.Y.I.

Vice-Chairman Corrado announced to the Commission and congratulated Ms. Connell on receiving the 1995 Karen B. Smith Chapter Achievement Award for the "Guide to Community Visioning" publication.

7. Director's Report

Ms. Connell advised the Commission that since it was an odd numbered year a new Chairman and Vice-Chairman would need to be appointed. The Commission suggested waiting until after new appointments in March.

Ms. Connell then passed out to each member a form developed by Dr. Hill titled Sherwood School District 88J City/County

Residential Impact Estimate. She explained that it was his attempt to evaluate the impact of the new subdivisions on the schools. After discussion the Commission agreed it would be an effective tool and proposed some suggestions for Ms. Connell to include in her comments to Dr. Hill. It was also agreed that Dr. Hill needed to come and discuss the issue with the Commission.

Mr. Hohnbaum informed the Commission that he would not be attending the February 7 meeting.

Ms. Stewart questioned if a business licence was needed by homes that are being used for residential care facilities. In response Ms. Connell answered that a business license was needed and that there were very strict requirements for these homes.

Mr. Hohnbaum questioned if anyone had heard anything from Pacific Lumber. Ms. Connell said no.

Mr. Bechtold addressed the issue of why the Commission was required to listen to the sales pitch that the developers presented to them knowing that most of it could not be enforced by the Commission once they received approval. The issue was discussed by the Commission.

8. **Adjournment:**

There being no further items before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Teresa Minor, Secretary